

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

E-FILED on 7/2/07

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

RAMBUS INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,
INC., SAMSUNG SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.,
SAMSUNG AUSTIN SEMICONDUCTOR,
L.P.,

Defendants.

No. C-05-02298 RMW

ORDER CLARIFYING THE COURT'S JUNE
19, 2007 ORDER

[Re Docket No. 152]

RAMBUS INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR INC., HYNIX
SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA INC.,
HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR
MANUFACTURING AMERICA INC.,

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,
INC., SAMSUNG SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.,
SAMSUNG AUSTIN SEMICONDUCTOR,
L.P.,

NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION,
NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION
U.S.A.,

Defendants.


No. C-05-00334 RMW

[Re Docket Nos. 244-245]

1 On June 19, 2007, this Court issued an order deferring ruling on Samsung's motion
2 for summary judgment based on collateral estoppel (hereinafter the "June 2007 Order"). On June
3 29, 2007, Rambus submitted a motion seeking clarification of a phrase within this Court's
4 description of the Samsung Virginia Case's background that Rambus contends is factually incorrect.
5 Specifically, the June 2007 Order states that "[a]fter a three and one-half day bench trial, the court
6 concluded that Rambus willfully and intentionally engaged in spoliation of evidence." Order at
7 4:12-14. This Court hereby clarifies its June 19, 2007 order to make clear that there was not a three
8 and one-half day bench trial in the Samsung Virginia Case, but rather the Court was referring to the
9 three and one-half day bench trial in the *Rambus v. Infineon* case, also in the Eastern District of
10 Virginia.

11 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the phrase "After a three and one-half day bench
12 trial" that appears on page 4, lines 12-13, of the June 19, 2007 Order shall be stricken.

13
14 DATED: 7 2 , 2007

By: 
Hon. Ronald M. Whyte

1 Notice of this document has been electronically sent to:

2 **Counsel for Plaintiff:**

3 Craig N. Tolliver	ctolliver@mckoolsmith.com
Pierre J. Hubert	phubert@mckoolsmith.com
4 Brian K. Erickson	berickson@dbllp.com,
David C. Vondle	dvondle@akingump.com
5 Gregory P. Stone	gregory.stone@mto.com
Carolyn Hoecker Luedtke	luedtkech@mto.com
6 Peter A. Detre	detrepa@mto.com
Burton Alexander Gross	burton.gross@mto.com,
7 Steven McCall Perry	steven.perry@mto.com
Jeannine Y. Sano	sanoj@howrey.com

9
10 **Counsel for Defendant(s):**

11 Matthew D. Powers	matthew.powers@weil.com
David J. Healey	david.healey@weil.com
12 Edward R. Reines	edward.reines@weil.com

13
14 Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel that have not
15 registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.

16 **Dated:** 7/2/07

SPT
Chambers of Judge Whyte